



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,532	12/11/2003	Julian Edward Sale	18396/2002B	9057

29933 7590 07/21/2005

PALMER & DODGE, LLP
KATHLEEN M. WILLIAMS
111 HUNTINGTON AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02199

EXAMINER

SULLIVAN, DANIEL M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1636

DATE MAILED: 07/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/733,532

Applicant(s)

SALE ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel M. Sullivan

Art Unit

1636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08).
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

S-0-0

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-31, as originally filed, are pending in the application.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-16, drawn to a method for preparing a cell line capable of directed constitutive hypermutation of a target nucleic acid, classified in class 435, subclass 440.
- II. Claims 17-28, drawn to a method for preparing a gene product having a desired activity using a cell produced according to the method of Group I, classified in class 435, subclass 69.1.
- III. Claims 29-31, drawn to a chicken bursal lymphoma cell line or chicken DT40 cell capable of directed constitutive hypermutation, classified in class 435, subclass 325.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the process is not limited to making a chicken bursal lymphoma cell line or DT40 cell capable of directed constitutive hypermutation. Therefore, the process can be used to make materially different products such as mammalian cells capable of constitutive directed constitutive

Art Unit: 1636

hypermutation. Furthermore, the method is limited to selecting only cells in which the rate of target nucleic acid mutation exceeds that of other nucleic acid mutation by a factor of 100 or more, while the cells are not limited to a rate of target nucleic acid mutation that exceeds that of other nucleic acid mutation by a factor of 100 or more. Thus, the cells could be obtained by a materially different process (i.e., a process wherein cells in which target nuclei acid mutation exceeds that of other nucleic acid mutation by a factor of less than 100 are selected).

Inventions III and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). Again, in the instant case, the cells are limited to chicken cells while the method is not limited to using chicken cells. Therefore, the process as claimed can be practiced with a materially different product, such as with a mammalian cell line capable of directed constitutive hypermutation of a target nucleic acid.

Inventions III, I and II are related as product, process of making and process of use. Where all three categories of invention are included, restriction three ways is proper if the process of making is distinct from the product (MPEP § 806.05(i)) as is demonstrated above for the product and process of making in the instant Application. Therefore restriction between the process of making (Group I) and process of using (Group II) is also proper.

In the absence of an allowable product claim to which the process claims are limited to making or using, examining the methods of Groups I and II together in a single application would impose a serious burden on the Office. *Prima facie* evidence for the additional burden

imposed by examining each additional method is evidenced by the separate classification of each method. Furthermore, as each method is limited to comprising elements to which the other methods are not limited, examination of each method requires a separate search for those elements that distinguish the respective methods. In addition, because each method encompasses subject matter not encompassed by the other methods, a determination that any one method is patentable over the art does not adequately support patentability of any of the other methods. Therefore, patentability of each method must be determined separately.

Although the Office acknowledges that in the event a product claim is deemed allowable, determining patentability of process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim does not impose an undue burden (see below), no such determination of patentability has been made in the instant case. In the event that the product is not patentable, a determination of whether each method of making and using the product is patentable over the art is based upon the particulars of the method and not on the product made by or used in the method. Therefore, until the product is deemed allowable, search and examination of the process claims with the product imposes an undue burden on the Office. As discussed in detail below, if a product claim is found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04.

Rejoinder in view of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer*

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim

Art Unit: 1636

will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier.

Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Art Unit: 1636

A telephone call was made to Kathleen Williams on 19 July 2005 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel M Sullivan whose telephone number is 571-272-0779. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Remy Yucel, Ph.D. can be reached on 571-272-0781. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1636

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Daniel M. Sullivan, Ph.D.
Examiner
Art Unit 1636


DANIEL M. SULLIVAN
PATENT EXAMINER